

## AMENDMENTS TO THE CLAIMS

This listing of claims will replace all prior versions and listings of claims in the application.

### Listing of Claims

Claim 1. (Original) A system for evaluating and selecting competition winners from a pool of candidates in a competition comprising:

a database for storing candidate documents;

a grouping subsystem coupled to said database for grouping said candidate documents into candidate data sets;

a qualification subsystem coupled to said database for determining said candidate data sets to be qualified or disqualified;

a pool reduction subsystem coupled to said database for determining whether said candidate data sets having been qualified meet a discretionary eligibility standard, said discretionary eligibility standard varying as a function of the number of said candidate data sets having been qualified;

an evaluation subsystem coupled to said qualification subsystem and said database for evaluating each of said candidate data sets having met said discretionary eligibility standard and scoring one or more evaluation variables in response to said evaluation; and

a selection subsystem coupled to said evaluation subsystem and database for selecting one or more competition finalists responsive to said evaluation and scoring of said candidate data sets having met said discretionary eligibility standard.

Claim 2. (Original) A system as in claim 1 further comprising: a document reception subsystem comprising: a network interface module coupled to said database for receiving electronic submissions, said database storing said electronic submissions as candidate documents, a scanner interface module for interfacing said system to a scanner and receiving scans of submitted hardcopy documents, and a data extraction module coupled to said

scanner interface module and said database for extracting data from said scans, said database storing said extracted data as candidate documents.

Claim 3. (Original) A system as in claim 2, further comprising: a duplicate checking module coupled to said network interface module, said data extraction module and said database for determining whether said candidate documents exist in said database, said candidate documents having been determined not to exist in said database being stored in said database.

Claim 4. (Original) A system as in claim 1 wherein said qualification subsystem comprises: a first filter module coupled to said database for determining whether said candidate data sets meet a data completeness standard.

Claim 5. (Original) A system as in claim 4 wherein said data completeness standard requires said candidate data sets to include a minimum set of document types.

Claim 6. (Original) A system as in claim 4 wherein said evaluation subsystem comprises: an evaluation workstation coupled to said database for facilitating evaluation of said candidate data sets having met said discretionary eligibility standard, said evaluation workstation comprising: a display for displaying information extracted from said candidate data sets, and an input device for entering information; a matching module coupled to said database for selecting a possible evaluator to evaluate one of said candidate data sets having met said discretionary eligibility standard; an evaluator eligibility module coupled to said database for determining whether said evaluator is permitted to evaluate said one of said candidate data sets having met said discretionary eligibility standard; and an evaluation module coupled to said evaluator eligibility module, said database, and said evaluation workstation for providing on said display information extracted from said one of said candidate data sets having met said discretionary eligibility standard, providing one or more

evaluation variables for scoring, and receiving a score for each of said one or more evaluation variables from said input device.

Claim 7. (Original) A system as in claim 1 wherein said selection system comprises: a phase 1 selection module coupled to said evaluation subsystem for selecting a first set of candidate finalists responsive to total scores generated responsive to corresponding said received scores, said first set of candidate finalists not exceeding a predetermined total number; said phase 1 selection module further outputting when said first set of candidate data sets is less than said predetermined number a sub-pool of said candidate data sets all having received equal corresponding said total scores; and a phase 2 selection module coupled to said phase 1 selection module and said database for selecting a second set of candidate finalists, said second set of candidate finalists being a subset of said sub-pool, said first set of candidate finalists plus said second set of said candidate finalists equal in number to said predetermined total number.

Claim 8. (Original) A system as in claim 7, said phase 1 selection module comprising: a scoring module coupled to said evaluation subsystem and said database for generating said total scores; a grouping module coupled to said scoring module and said database for grouping said candidate data sets into score tiers responsive to corresponding said total scores, each of said score tiers comprising one or more of said candidate data sets having equal said total scores; a selection module coupled to said ranking module, said ranking workstation, and said database for selecting a first set of candidate finalists responsive to said ranking, said first set of candidate finalists equal to or less than said predetermined total number; and an output module for outputting said sub-pool, said sub-pool of candidate profiles comprising one of said score tiers, said one of said score tiers having the highest total score of those of said score tiers containing candidate profiles not selected for said first set of candidate profiles.

Claim 9. (Original) A system as in claim 7, said phase 2 selection module comprising: a receiving submodule coupled to said for receiving said sub-pool of said candidate data sets from said phase 1 selection module; an evaluation response selection submodule for determining one of said received scores to be weighted and a weight; a weighting submodule coupled to said selection module and said evaluation response selection submodule for weighting said one of said received scores of said candidate data sets in said sub-pool; a scoring submodule coupled to said weighting submodule for generating weighted scores for said candidate data sets in said sub-pool; a grouping submodule coupled to said scoring submodule for grouping said candidate data sets in said sub-pool into sub-tiers responsive to corresponding weighted scores; a selection submodule for selecting additional candidate finalists responsive to said weighted evaluation tier ranking; and a stop submodule for determining when a correct number of candidate finalists have been selected and outputting said additional candidate finalists.

Claim 10. (Original) A system as in claim 1 wherein said selection system comprises: a scoring module for summing evaluation scores for each of said candidate data sets having been evaluated; a score grouping module for grouping said candidate data sets having been evaluated into score tiers each comprising substantially similar corresponding ones of evaluation score sums; a phase 1 selection module for selecting all said candidate data sets of the score tiers beginning with the score tier having the highest median evaluation score sum and proceeding to score tiers of successively lower median evaluation score sums such that the number of candidate documents selected is maximized without exceeding a predetermined number, said phase 1 selection module further outputting an active group, said active group comprising the candidate data sets of the score tier having the highest median evaluation score sum containing no candidates having been selected; and a phase 2 selection module for selecting a subset of said active group.

Claim 11. (Original) A system as in claim 10 wherein said phase 2 selection system comprises: a weighting module for weighting said evaluation scores for each of said

candidate data sets in said active group; a summing module for summing said weighted evaluation scores for each of said candidate data sets in said active group; a score grouping module for grouping said candidate data sets in said active group into phase 2 score tiers by substantially similar corresponding said evaluation score sums; a tie-breaking selection module for selecting all candidate documents within the phase 2 score tiers beginning with the phase 2 score tier having the highest median evaluation score sum and proceeding to phase 2 score tiers of successively lower median evaluation score sums such that the total number of selected said candidate data sets is maximized without exceeding said predetermined number; and a designating module for designating the candidate data sets of the phase 2 score tier having the highest median evaluation score sum containing no candidates having been selected as the active group.

Claim 12. (Original) A system as in claim 1 further comprising: a monitoring subsystem coupled to said evaluation subsystem for monitoring evaluations of qualified said candidate data sets, said monitoring subsystem allowing interaction with an ongoing evaluation, said monitoring subsystem allowing nullification of an evaluation when said evaluation is determined to be inconsistent with the requirements of said competition.

Claim 13. (Original) A system as in claim 1 further comprising: a confirmation subsystem coupled to said selection subsystem and said database for determining the confirmation status of said one or more competition finalists and determining one or more competition winners responsive to said confirmation status determination.

Claim 14. (Original) A system as in claim 13 wherein said confirmation subsystem comprises: a workstation comprising: a display for displaying candidate packages and corresponding confirmation documents, and an input device for entering information; a confirmation document request module coupled to said database for requesting confirmation documents; a confirmation module coupled to said workstation and said database for providing said candidate packages and said corresponding confirmation documents to said

workstation for display and for receiving confirmation responses; and a conversion module coupled to said workstation and said database for marking ones of said candidate data sets as non-selected responsive to a corresponding confirmation response indicating nonconfirmation and for marking ones of candidate data sets as competition winners responsive to a corresponding confirmation response indicating confirmation.

Claim 15. (Original) A system as in claim 1 further comprising: a competition winner tracking subsystem coupled to said database for tracking said competition winners comprising: a competition winner tracking module coupled to said database for determining when update documents are required for a competition winner, an update document request module coupled to said competition-winner module for coordinating update document request correspondence, and an update module coupled to said database for updating confirmation winner packages with said required update documents.

Claim 16. (Original) A system as in claim 15, wherein said competition winner tracking subsystem further comprises: a workstation comprising: a display for displaying information from one of said candidate data sets and corresponding confirmation documents, and an input device for entering information; and a reconfirmation module coupled to workstation and said database for displaying the candidate data sets of said competition winners with corresponding said required documents and receiving reconfirmation responses, the status of the candidate data sets of said competition winners being updated in response to said reconfirmation responses.

Claims 17-20 (Cancelled).

Claim 21. (Currently Amended) A system for evaluating and selecting competition winners from a pool of candidates in a competition comprising:  
a database for storing candidate records;

a qualification subsystem coupled to said database for determining said candidate records  
to be qualified or disqualified;  
a grouping subsystem coupled to said database for grouping said candidate records into  
evaluation groups responsive to information contained in said candidate records;  
an evaluation subsystem coupled to said qualification subsystem and said database for  
evaluating and scoring each of said candidate records having been qualified over one or more  
evaluation variables; [[and]]  
a selection subsystem coupled to said evaluation subsystem and database for selecting  
one or more competition finalists for each of said evaluation groups responsive to said  
evaluation and scoring of said candidate records having been qualified; and  
a tracking subsystem coupled to said evaluation subsystem for tracking said one or  
more competition finalists and one or more non-selected candidates and determining an  
actual success indicator for each of one or more performance variables.

Claim 22. (Original) A system as in claim 21, further comprising: an eligibility subsystem  
coupled to said database for determining said competition records to be eligible or ineligible  
responsive to a minimum eligibility standard and information contained in said competition  
records, each of said evaluation groups having a corresponding said minimum eligibility  
standard.

Claim 23. (Original) A system as in claim 22, wherein said minimum eligibility standard  
varies with the number of candidate profiles.

Claim 24. (Original) A system for selecting one or more candidates from a plurality of  
candidate profiles comprising: a storage adapted to store a plurality of candidate profiles; an  
eligibility unit coupled to said storage adapted to determine said candidate profiles to be  
eligible or ineligible; an evaluation unit coupled to said storage adapted to facilitate

evaluation of said candidate profiles by the scoring of one or more variables by one or more evaluators; a first selection unit coupled to said storage adapted to receive said variables having been scored, said first selection unit further adapted to select a subset of said candidate profiles responsive to said variables having been scored, said subset of said candidate profiles not exceeding a predetermined value in number; and a second selection unit coupled to said first selection unit and said storage adapted to receive a sub-pool of said candidate profiles and adapted to output a subset of said sub-pool of candidate profiles responsive to application of predetermined variable weights to said variables having been scored, said subset of said candidate profiles added to said subset of said sub-pool of candidate profiles equaling said predetermined value in number.

Claim 25. (Currently Amended)      A ~~method~~ system as in claim 24, said first selection unit comprising:

- a scoring module coupled to said storage adapted to generate total scores for said candidate profiles responsive to said variables;

- a grouping module coupled to said scoring module and said storage for grouping said candidate profiles into score tiers responsive to corresponding said total scores, each said score tiers comprising one or more said candidate profiles having equal said total scores;

- a selection module coupled to said grouping module and said storage for selecting a first set of candidate profiles responsive to said grouping, said first set of candidate profiles equal to or less than said predetermined total number, said candidate profiles in said first set of candidate profiles having corresponding said total scores higher than said total scores of any said candidate profiles not in said first set of candidate profiles; and

- an output module for outputting said sub-pool of candidate profiles, said sub-pool of said candidate profiles comprising one of said score tiers, said one of said score tiers having the highest total score of those of said score tiers containing candidate profiles not selected for said first set of candidate profiles.



Claim 26. (Currently Amended) A ~~method~~ system as in claim 24, said second selection unit comprising:

- a receiving module coupled to said for receiving said sub-pool of said candidate profiles from said phase I selection module;

- an evaluation response selection submodule for determining one of said one or more evaluation responses to be weighted and a weight,

- a weighting module coupled to said selection module and said evaluation response selection submodule for weighting said one of said evaluation responses of candidate data sets in said sub-pool,

- a scoring module coupled to said weighting module for generating weighted scores for said candidate profiles in said sub-pool;

- a grouping module coupled to said scoring module for grouping said candidate profiles in said sub-pool into sub-tiers responsive to corresponding weighted scores,

- a selection module for selecting additional candidate profiles responsive to said weighted evaluation tier ranking, and

- a stop module for determining when a correct number of candidate profiles have been selected and outputting said additional candidate profiles.

Claim 27. (Currently Amended) A method for administering a competition system comprising:

- receiving one or more candidate packages, each said candidate package containing information about a candidate in a competition;

- for each said candidate package:

- determining whether said candidate package meets a minimum application standard,

- selecting said candidate package when said candidate package is determined to meet said

- minimum application standard,

- selecting an evaluator,

- enabling said evaluator to evaluate said selected candidate package, [[and]]

receiving an evaluation of said selected candidate package from said evaluator;  
ranking all said evaluated candidate packages responsive to corresponding received  
said evaluations; [[and]]  
selecting a predetermined number of competition finalists responsive to said  
calculated  
overall scores[[,]]; and  
tracking the performance of said competition finalists and one or more non-selected  
candidates; and determining an actual success indicator for each of said competition finalists  
and said non-selected candidates.

Claim 28. (Original) The method of claim 27 wherein said step of selecting an evaluator  
comprises: choosing an evaluator; determining whether said evaluator is eligible to evaluate  
said selected candidate package; choosing another evaluator and returning to said step of  
determining whether said evaluator is eligible to evaluate said selected candidate package  
responsive to said determination of whether said evaluator is eligible to evaluate said selected  
candidate package indicating said evaluator is not eligible to evaluate said selected candidate  
package; and selecting said evaluator responsive to said determination indicating said  
evaluator is eligible to evaluate said selected candidate package.

Claim 29. (Original) The method as in claim 28 wherein the step of determining whether  
said evaluator is eligible to evaluate said candidate package comprises: sending an evaluator  
eligibility question to said evaluator; receiving a response to said evaluator eligibility  
question from said evaluator; and determining whether said evaluator is eligible to evaluate  
said queued candidate package responsive to said received response regarding said evaluator  
eligibility question.

Claim 30. (Original) The method as in claim 27, wherein said step of receiving a plurality of  
candidate packages, each said candidate package containing information about a candidate in  
a competition comprises: receiving a plurality of application documents each relating to a

candidate; and grouping said application documents such that all said application documents relating to the same candidate are grouped into a candidate package.

Claim 31. (Original) The method of claim 27, said method further comprising: determining whether said selected candidate package is eligible to be evaluated; and denying said evaluator from evaluating said selected candidate package responsive to said determination indicating said selected candidate package is not eligible to be evaluated.

Claim 32. (Original) The method as in claim 27 wherein the step of determining whether said candidate package is eligible to be evaluated comprises: sending a candidate package eligibility question to said evaluator; receiving a response from said evaluator regarding said candidate package eligibility question; and determining whether said candidate package is eligible for evaluation responsive to said received response regarding said candidate package eligibility question.

Claim 33. (Original) A method as in claim 27 wherein said one or more minimum application standards comprises: one or more minimum response standards; one or more eligibility requirements; and one or more qualification requirements.

Claim 34. (Original) A method as in claim 27 further comprising: determining whether any of said competition finalists are confirmed; and selecting a new competition finalist for each competition finalist determined not to be confirmed and returning to said step of determining whether any of said competition finalists are confirmed.

Claim 35. (Original) A method for selecting one or more candidates from a plurality of candidate applications in a competition system, comprising: determining for each of said candidate applications whether said candidate application meets minimum qualification standards; determining the number of said candidate applications meeting said minimum qualification standards; determining for each said candidate application meeting said

minimum qualification standards whether said candidate application meets a discretionary qualification standard, said discretionary qualification standard being a function of said determined number of said candidate applications meeting said minimum qualification standards; evaluating each said candidate application determined to meet said minimum qualification standards; scoring each of said candidate applications that has been evaluated over a set of evaluation variables; and selecting one or more of said candidates as competition finalists responsive to said scoring.

Claim 36. (Original) A method as in claim 35 wherein said step of determining for each said candidate application whether said candidate application meets minimum qualification standards comprises: i) filtering each candidate's candidate information to determine whether said candidate's candidate information meets at least one of an information completeness standard and a document completeness standard; ii) filtering said candidate information to ensure said candidate information indicates said candidate meets one or more minimum qualification requirements; iii) grouping said candidate information into two or more groups responsive to one or more predetermined pieces of information contained in said candidate information; and iv) filtering said candidate information to ensure said candidate information indicates said candidate meets one or more group level standards.

Claim 37. (Original) A method as in claim 35 wherein said step of filtering said candidate information to ensure said candidate information indicates said candidate meets one or more minimum qualification requirements comprises requiring each said candidate's candidate information includes at least a candidate application, a nomination form, and a recommendation form.

Claim 38. (Original) A method as in claim 35 wherein said step of filtering said candidate information to ensure said candidate information indicates said candidate meets one or more group level standards comprises passing said candidate when said candidate information

meets or exceeds at least one of a minimum GPA score, a family income requirement, and completion of a GED.

Claim 39. (Original) A method as in claim 35 wherein said step of grouping comprises grouping said candidates by one or more of the following candidate information: geographical residence, urban/rural upbringing, primary ethnicity, and cultural background.

Claim 40. (Original) A method as in claim 35 wherein said step of filtering said candidate information to ensure said candidate information indicates said candidate meets one or more group level standards comprises passing said candidate when said candidate information indicates said candidate meets or exceeds a third filter set, said third filter set comprising at least one of a minimum number of academic awards, a minimum number of public awards, a minimum number of honors, a minimum number of leadership roles, a minimum number of student excel bubbles completed, a minimum class rigor average, a minimum amount of community service, a maximum amount of personal circumstance exceptions, and a minimum number of paid hours of employment.

Claim 41. (Original) A method as in claim 35 wherein said step of evaluating comprises the steps of: matching each said candidate information with a reader qualified to read said candidate information, a reader being disqualified from reading a particular candidate's candidate information when any conflicts exist; and reading each said candidate information by said reader, said step of reading comprising scoring said candidate information on a set of reading variables.

Claim 42. (Currently Amended) A method as in claim 41 wherein said set of reading variables includes ~~the following non-cognitive variables~~, said non-cognitive variables comprising[[:]] a positive self-concept variable, a realistic self-appraisal variable, an understanding/navigation of a social system variable, a preference of long-term goals over short-term goals variable, an availability of a strong support person variable, a leadership

experience variable, a community service variable, and an interest/knowledge in a non-school field variable.

Claim 43. (Original) A method as in claim 35 wherein said step of selecting comprises the steps of: summing said evaluation variable scores for each of said candidate applications to produce a total reading variable score; ranking said candidate applications by their respective total reading variable score; determining the highest score tier having ones of said candidate applications not already selected; determining whether the sum of all said candidate applications already selected plus the number of said candidate applications at the current score tier exceeds the total number of said candidate applications to be selected; when the sum of all said candidate applications already selected plus the number of said candidate applications at the current score tier is less than the total number of said candidate applications to be selected, selecting the candidate applications in the current score tier and continuing back to said step of determining the highest score tier; when the sum of all said candidate applications already selected plus the number of said candidate applications at the current score tier equals the total number of said candidate applications to be selected, selecting the candidate applications at the current score tier and aborting any further selection; when the sum of all said candidate applications already selected plus the number of said candidate applications at the current score tier exceeds the total number of said candidate applications to be selected, carrying out the steps of: determining the next highest score tier having one or more said candidate applications not already selected, selecting one of said set of evaluation variables; altering the weight of said selected evaluation variable over all unselected said candidate applications in the score tier determined to be the next highest to produce weighted sets of reading scores, summing each said candidate applications weighted evaluation variable scores to produce a total evaluation variable score; grouping said candidate applications by their respective total weighted reading variable scores; beginning with the highest ranking total weighted reading variable score group and continuing successively to the next lower total weighted reading variable score group, selecting the candidate applications of as many total weighted evaluation variable score groups as possible

without exceeding the total number of said candidate applications to be selected, and selecting a previously-unselected evaluation variable from said set of evaluation variables and returning to said step of altering the weight of said selected evaluation variable and continuing.

Claim 44. (Currently Amended) A method as in claim 35 ~~wherein said step of~~ further comprising requesting confirmation documents from one or more of said competition finalists. ~~confirming comprises requiring each said candidate's candidate information to include a specification of citizenship or primary residency, a tribal document when said candidate is American Indian, information regarding community service, information regarding employment, information regarding honors and awards, and information regarding leadership experience.~~

Claims 45-53 (Cancelled).

Claim 54. (Original) A method of reducing the number of candidates in a candidate pool of a competition system, each candidate being represented in said competition system by a corresponding candidate information package, said method comprising: determining whether each candidate information package in said candidate pool meets an information completeness standard and a document completeness standard; removing all candidate information packages from said candidate pool which do not meet said information completeness standard and said document completeness standard; determining whether each said candidate information package in said candidate pool indicates the corresponding candidate meets one or more minimum qualification standards; removing all candidate information packages from said candidate pool which do not indicate the corresponding candidate meets said minimum qualification standards; grouping said candidate information packages in said candidate pool into one or more groups based on information contained in said candidate information packages; determining whether said candidate information packages in said candidate pool indicate the corresponding candidate meets one or more

discretionary standards; and removing all candidate information packages from said candidate pool which do not indicate the corresponding candidate meets said one or more discretionary standards.

Claim 55. (Original) A method as in claim 54 wherein said step of determining whether each candidate information package in said candidate pool meets an information completeness standard and a document completeness standard comprises determining whether each said candidate information package includes at least a candidate application, a nomination form, and a recommendation form.

Claim 56. (Original) A method as in claim 54 wherein said step of determining whether each said candidate information package in said candidate pool indicates the corresponding candidate meets one or more minimum qualification standards comprises passing said candidate when said candidate information meets or exceeds at least one of a minimum GPA score, a family income requirement, and completion of a GED.

Claim 57. (Original) A method as in claim 54 wherein said step of grouping comprises grouping said candidates by one or more of geographical residence, urban/rural upbringing, primary ethnicity, and cultural background.

Claim 58. (Original) A method as in claim 54 wherein said step of determining whether said candidate information packages in said candidate pool indicate the corresponding candidate meets one or more discretionary standards comprises determining whether said candidate information indicates said candidate meets or exceeds a third filter set, said third filter set comprising at least one of a minimum number of academic awards, a minimum number of public awards, a minimum number of honors, a minimum number of leadership roles, a minimum number of student excel bubbles completed, a minimum class rigor average, a minimum amount of community service, a maximum amount of personal circumstance exceptions, and a minimum number of paid hours of employment.



Claim 59. (Original) A method as in claim 54 wherein said step of determining whether said candidate information packages in said candidate pool indicate the corresponding candidate meets one or more discretionary standards comprises determining whether said candidate information indicates said candidate meets or exceeds a minimum number of academic awards, a minimum number of public awards, a minimum number of honors, a minimum number of leadership roles, a minimum number of student excel bubbles completed, a minimum class rigor average, a minimum amount of community service, a maximum amount of personal circumstance exceptions, and a minimum number of paid hours of employment.

Claims 60-66 (Cancelled).

Claim 67. (Currently Amended) A method of monitoring the evaluation of individuals in a pool of candidates in a competition system comprising:

receiving one or more evaluator responses for an evaluation from a first evaluator;

analyzing said evaluation responses; and

determining whether said evaluation should be nullified based on said analysis.

~~receiving data from an evaluation; determining from said data an evaluation index;  
comparing said evaluation index to corresponding reference indicies and determining whether  
said evaluation is aberrant responsive to said comparison.~~

Claim 68. (Currently Amended) A method as in claim [[65]] 67, wherein said analysis comprises comparing at least one of said evaluator responses to one or more evaluator responses given by said evaluator in at least one previously completed evaluation. ~~evaluation index comprises one or more evaluation responses and said corresponding reference indicies comprise one or more of: the average corresponding evaluation responses of said evaluator for the corresponding evaluation responses over two or more prior completed evaluations and the average corresponding evaluation responses for one or more other evaluators in said competition system over two or more prior completed evaluations.~~

Claim 69. (Currently Amended) A method as in claim 67, wherein said analysis ~~comprises comparing a evaluation index~~ comprises the number of reference sources checked per evaluator evaluation response ~~to and said corresponding reference indicies~~ comprise a minimum number of sources to be checked per evaluator ~~evaluation~~ response.

Claim 70. (Currently Amended) A method as in claim 67, wherein said analysis ~~comprises comparing an evaluation index~~ comprises the average time between said evaluator responses given in said evaluation ~~and said corresponding reference indicies~~ ~~comprise one or more of: the to an average corresponding~~ average time between prior evaluator responses of said evaluator ~~over~~ given in at least one ~~two or more~~ prior completed evaluation. ~~evaluations and the average corresponding average time between responses for one or more other evaluators in said competition system over two or more prior completed evaluations.~~

Claim 71 (Cancelled).

Claim 72. (Original) A method of ensuring fair and consistent evaluation comprising:  
providing an evaluation workstation for use by an evaluator; making available  
candidate  
applications from one or more candidates needing evaluation;  
matching said evaluator to one or more of said candidate applications;  
receiving a request from said evaluator to evaluate one of said one or more candidate  
applications;  
providing one or more eligibility questions to said evaluator;  
receiving responses to said eligibility questions;  
determining from said responses to said eligibility questions whether said evaluator is  
eligible to evaluate said one candidate application;  
preventing said evaluator from evaluating said candidate application responsive to  
said

first determination indicating said evaluator is not eligible to evaluate said candidate application;

providing one or more candidate eligibility questions to said evaluator;

receiving responses to said candidate eligibility questions;

determining from said responses to said candidate eligibility questions whether said candidate is eligible to be evaluated;

preventing said evaluator from evaluating said candidate application responsive to said second determination indicating said candidate is not eligible to be evaluated;

presenting in a substantially simultaneous manner, said candidate application, an evaluation rubric, and a scoring display to said evaluator;

monitoring the evaluation of said candidate package by said evaluator; and

interacting with said evaluation responsive to the determination that said evaluation is unfair or inconsistent.

Claim 73. (Currently Amended) A method as in claim 72 wherein said step of monitoring includes at least one of detecting whether the average time between question responses is less than a minimum time period, ~~determination~~ determining whether the average time between question responses is less than the average time period between question responses for said evaluator during past evaluations, determining whether the average evaluation score is above a maximum score, determining whether the average evaluation score is below a minimum score, and determination whether any evaluation score is inconsistent with information in said candidate application.

Claim 74. (Original) A method as in claim 72 wherein said step of interacting comprises at least one of terminating said evaluation, initiating a conversation with said evaluator, and providing an automated message to said evaluator.

Claims 75- 90 (Cancelled).

Claim 91. (New) A method as in claim 67 wherein said analysis comprises comparing at least one of said evaluator responses given in said evaluation to one or more evaluator responses given by a second evaluator.

Claim 92. (New) A method as in claim 67, wherein said analysis comprises comparing an average time between said evaluator responses given in said evaluation to an average time between evaluator responses for one or more evaluator responses given by a second evaluator.

Claim 93 (New) A system as in claim 1, further comprising a tracking subsystem coupled to said evaluation subsystem for tracking said one or more competition finalists and one or more non-selected candidates and determining an actual success indicator for each of one or more performance variables.